

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 and have cancelled Claims 4, 9, 12 and 13. No new matter was added by these amendments. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11 and 14-20 remain in the application. Applicants request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and these remarks and arguments.

Embodiments of the present invention recited in independent Claims 1 and 14 are directed to a service management agent that is associated with a communication device in a single wireless communication system. The service management agent manages the provision in the single wireless communication system of a plurality of different types of services from a plurality of service providers to the communication device.

The Examiner has rejected: Claims 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reichelt, et al. (USPN 6295447). Applicants have cancelled Claim 9, thereby, rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of this claim. Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claim 14. Applicants have amended Claim 14 to include the limitations directed to services provided by a plurality of service providers, which the Examiner concedes on page 4 of the Office Action is not disclosed in Reichelt, et al. Accordingly, since the Reichelt, et al. reference does not disclose some limitations of Claim 14, Applicants request that the Examiner remove the 102(e) rejection of this claim.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 1-8, 10, 11, 15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reichelt, et al. as applied to Claims 9 and 14 and in further view of Rabe, et al. (USPN 6138010). Applicants have cancelled Claim 4, thereby, rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of this claim. Applicants traverse the remaining rejections.

As argued above, the Examiner has conceded that Reichelt fails to disclose the recitations in Claims 1 and 14 of services provided by a plurality of service providers, but the Examiner argues that Rabe, et al. discloses these limitations. However, Applicants have further amended Claims 1 and 14 to clarify not only that a plurality of *different types*

of services are provided by a plurality of service providers but that these different types of services are provided in *a single* wireless communication system, which is not disclosed in the Rabe, et al. reference. Rabe, et al. instead discloses a multi-mode communication device that is able to communicate with a plurality of *different autonomous wireless communication systems*, each providing *the same type* (i.e., radio communications) of service (col. 3, lines 8-17 and 39-47).

Therefore, since the combined teachings of Reichelt and Rabe do not disclose some limitations recited in Claims 1 and 14, Applicants request that the Examiner remove the 103(a) rejections of Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11, 15 and 17-20 in view of these references.

The Examiner has further rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reichelt, et al. as applied to Claim 9 and in further view of Giordano, III, et al. (USPN 6285364) and has rejected Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reichelt, et al. as applied to Claim 9 and in further view of Rabe, et al. and Giordano, III, et al. Applicants have cancelled Claims 12 and 13, thereby, rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of these claims.

Finally, the Examiner has rejected Claim 16 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reichelt, et al. as applied to Claim 14, and further in view of Mangal (USPN 6801519). Applicants' arguments above with respect to Claim 14 also apply to Claim 16 (since the Mangal reference also does not disclose a service management agent that manages the provision in the single wireless communication system of a plurality of different types of services from a plurality of service providers to the communication device). Applicants, therefore, likewise request that the Examiner remove the 103(a) rejection of Claim 16.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

By: /Valerie M. Davis/
Valerie M. Davis
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 50,203

Telephone: 847-576-6733
Fax No.: 847-576-0721